Frankie Belford 2-28-11

1. What does it mean that the effort to raise Wikipedia’s female contributors from fewer than 15 percent to 25 percent by 2015 is “not diversity for diversity’s sake”? Because the media is filled with mostly men women account for about 13%.
2. Why are there so few female contributors to Wikipedia, according to the article, and why might this be viewed as a problem in terms of the site’s goals and principles? Because women don’t assert themselves as a men do.
3. What are some examples of the way the gender disparity affects the topics on the site?

A topic generally restricted to teenage girls, like friendship bracelets, can seem short at four paragraphs when compared with lengthy articles on something boys might favor, like, toy soldiers or baseball cards, whose voluminous entry includes a detailed chronological history of the subject.

1. How do you think Wikipedia can encourage everyone to participate in the project without using “women-specific remedies like recruitment or quotas”? What are some ways Wikipedia might use “subtle persuasion and outreach” to encourage a more inclusive contributor ship?
2. How long do you think it might take to equalize the gender disparity in Wikipedia contributor ship? Why? I think that this will take a long time to change because change doesn’t occur overnight.
3. Do you think that younger generations born into a culture of frequent online engagement in “democratic” spaces (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, etc.) will be less likely to experience gender disparity when it comes to Wikipedia and other public thought forums in the future? Why or why not? NO because Facebook is a very diverse website.